

Annex 1. Country Sample

	Income Group	Region	Island States	Costal	Landlocked
Antigua & Barbuda	High-income	WHD	Y		
Bahamas	High-income	WHD	Y		
Belize	Upper middle-income	WHD		Y	
Bhutan	Lower middle-income	APD			Y
Cabo Verde	Lower middle-income	AFR	Y		
Comoros	Lower middle-income	AFR	Y		
Djibouti	Lower middle-income	MENA		Y	
Dominica	Upper middle-income	WHD	Y		
Fiji	Upper middle-income	APD	Y		
Grenada	Upper middle-income	WHD	Y		
Guyana	Upper middle-income	WHD		Y	
Kiribati	Lower middle-income	APD	Y		
Maldives	High-income	APD	Y		
Mauritius	Upper middle-income	AFR	Y		
Micronesia	Lower middle-income	APD	Y		
Saint Kitts and Nevis	High-income	WHD	Y		
Saint Lucia	Upper middle-income	WHD	Y		
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Upper middle-income	WHD	Y		
Samoa	Upper middle-income	APD	Y		
Sao Tome and Principe	Lower middle-income	AFR	Y		
Seychelles	High-income	AFR	Y		
Solomon Islands	Lower middle-income	APD	Y		
Timor-Leste	Lower middle-income	APD	Y		
Tuvalu	Lower middle-income	APD	Y		
Vanuatu	Lower middle-income	APD	Y		
Total SDS	25		21	3	1

Sources: WEO (2019)

Note: IMF Guidance Note (IMF 2018) classifies SDS in four income groups: (i) high-income SDS, as countries with GDP per capita above US\$12476, (ii) upper middle-income, as countries with GDP per capita between US\$4036 and US\$12475; (iii) lower middle-income SDS as countries with GDP per capita between US\$1026 and US\$4035; and (iv) low-income SDS with GDP per capita below US\$1025. Our sample does not include low-income SDS.

Annex 2. An indication of National Hazard Categories and Intensities in SDS

	Cyclone/ Typhoon/ Hurricane	Earth quake	Landslide	Tsunami	Volcano	Urban Flood	Coastal Flood	River Flood	Extreme Heat	Water Scarcity	Wildfire
Antigua & Barbuda		Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Red	Orange	Yellow	Orange		Yellow
Bahamas	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Orange		Yellow	Red	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Belize	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow		Red	Orange	Red	Red	Orange	Red
Bhutan	Yellow	Orange	Red			Red		Red	Red	Orange	Red
Cabo Verde		Yellow	Yellow			Yellow		Yellow		Yellow	Red
Comoros	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Djibouti	Yellow	Orange	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Orange	Red
Dominica		Orange	Red	Orange	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow	Yellow		Yellow
Fiji	Red	Orange	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow	Red
Grenada		Orange	Red	Orange		Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow		Yellow
Guyana	Yellow		Yellow	Orange		Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow	Red
Kiribati	Yellow		Yellow	Red		Yellow	Red	Yellow	Orange		Yellow
Maldives			Yellow	Orange			Yellow			Orange	Yellow
Mauritius	Red	Yellow	Red	Orange			Orange		Orange		Yellow
Micronesia	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Orange			Orange		Orange		Yellow
Saint Kitts and Nevis		Orange	Orange	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Orange		Yellow
Saint Lucia		Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Orange		Yellow
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		Orange	Red	Orange		Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Samoa	Red	Orange	Yellow	Red	Yellow		Orange		Orange		Yellow
Sao Tome and Principe		Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Orange		Yellow
Seychelles	Red	Yellow	Orange	Orange		Yellow	Red	Yellow	Orange		Yellow
Solomon Islands	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Red	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Orange
Timor-Leste	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow	Red	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Red
Tonga	Red	Red	Orange	Red	Orange		Orange		Orange		Yellow
Tuvalu			Yellow	Orange			Red				Yellow
Vanuatu	Red	Red	Orange	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow

Source: ThinkHazard, GFDRR. .

Notes: ThinkHazard indicates the intensity of potential natural hazards and disasters by calculating the probability of frequency and severity. Red shows a climate-related disaster with high severity and frequency; Orange— a potentially damaging disaster that is expected to occur in a human lifetime; Yellow—a low or very low potentially damaging event less likely to occur in a human lifetime. The ThinkHazard exposure profiles have been used as a comparable example of the possible set of hazards across all SDS included in this study, however, the ThinkHazard assessment is not always complete due to a lack of comparable data. For example, some Caribbean islands such as Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia and St Vincent and the Grenadines are vulnerable to the impacts caused by hurricanes. Detailed individual country and regional assessments are needed to fully understand the costs of resilience in each country.

Annex 3. Selected Data Sources

Education	Energy	Health	Roads	Water and Sanitation
WEO 2019	WEO 2019	WEO 2019	WEO 2019	WEO 2019
	IRENA			
Notre Dame-Global Adaptation Initiative (ND-GAIN),	Notre Dame-Global Adaptation Initiative (ND-GAIN),	Notre Dame-Global Adaptation Initiative (ND-GAIN),	Notre Dame-Global Adaptation Initiative (ND-GAIN),	Notre Dame-Global Adaptation Initiative (ND-GAIN),
Global Risk Index	Global Risk Index	Global Risk Index	Global Risk Index	Global Risk Index
	World Bank World Development Indicators (current access to electricity, per capita electricity consumption)	WHO Global Health Observatory (doctor density, ratio of doctors to all other medical staff)	World Bank (Rural Access Index, population density, economic shares of manufacturing and agriculture) CIA Factbook and International Road Federation World Road Statistics (current number of road kilometers, country area)	Hutton and Varughese (2016)
UNESCO (share of non-teacher wages in current spending, shares of current non-compensatory and capital spending)		World Bank (share of doctor and non-doctor compensation in total spending)		Burdescu and others (2020)
World Bank (HDI, WDI, GFDRR)		OECD Health statistics (ratio of non-doctor compensation to doctor compensation)		
UNICEF				
UNSTAT	UNSTAT	UNSTAT	UNSTAT	UNSTAT
UNFCCC	UNFCCC	UNFCCC	UNFCCC	UNFCCC

Source: Gaspar and others (2019); Authors.

Annex 4. Summary Statistics

	Climate Vulnerability	Rating of climate-related loss/GDP 1999-2018	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Policy and Institutional Readiness to Climate Change	Health Outcomes (Adjusted)	Education Outcomes (Adjusted)	Renewable Energy Generation Target	Rural Access Index	Access to Basic Water Services	Health Spending (latest available)	Education Spending (latest available)
	(index 0 less to 1 more)	(rank 1 max loss to 180)	(% of total)	(index 0 less to 1 most)	(score 0 less to 10 more)	to add	(in % of total)	(0-100)	(% of total population)	(% of GDP)	(% of GDP)
<i>Median</i>											
Lower Middle-Income	0.54	28.00	0.00	0.38	0.23	0.45	50.00	77.00	84.00	5.17	7.86
Upper Middle-Income	0.44	15.00	0.00	0.45	0.43	0.55	85.00	78.00	96.50	5.24	4.61
High-Income	0.48	14.00	0.00	0.43	0.55	0.60	50.00	83.50	98.00	5.76	3.00
<i>Median</i>											
APD	0.53	14	0.0	0.42	0.28	0.45	85	77	93	5.21	6.74
WHD	0.46	10.00	0.00	0.45	0.55	0.57	50	85	97	4.95	3.65
SSA+MENA	0.49	135	0.0	0.30	0.34	0.62	45	80	86	5.46	6.04
Total SDS			0.08								
Median SDS	0.48	16		0.42	0.33	0.51	70	81	96	5.24	5.56
Average SDS	0.49	40		0.40	0.66	0.52	68	80	91	6.41	6.16

Sources: Global Climate Risk, IMF , NDCs, ND-GAIN, UNICEF, World Bank (WDI, HDI), WHO.

Annex 5. Tax Capacity Estimates using Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA)

This annex discusses briefly the methodology used to estimate tax capacity in 19 SDS using an SFA (Martinez-Vazquez and others 2013) and provides the main results. The methodological approach follows Langford and Ohlenberg (2016) in the sense that we use a time-varying true random effects model which takes into account random shocks, accounts for heterogeneity within the panel, and distinguishes between invariable or persistent structural factors and time-varying factors affecting countries' tax effort. However, we use a different specification to the one used by Langford and Ohlenberg (2016). Our specification is tailored, and the sample is limited to SDS to capture their unique characteristics compared to larger economies. This may lead to a different frontier compared with larger economies.⁴² Furthermore, to better capture SDS features, we adjust and augment the standard set of explanatory variables used in the literature. The chosen specification attempts to mimic the most important tax bases from which SDS collect revenue. Another advantage of this selective approach is that targeted estimates—that also account for SDS data limitation—allow us to estimate tax potential for SDS usually omitted in the empirical work in this area.

Methodology

An SFA models a production function (Equation 1) in which inputs— X_{it} —are transformed into tax revenues (TR_{it}) for country i in year t . In this approach, countries potentially collect less than it would be possible due to a level of inefficiency (E_{it}), this is random normally distributed and independent of the inefficiency shocks (V_{it}).

$$TR_{it} = f(X_{it}, \beta) \cdot E_{it} \cdot \exp^{V_{it}}; \quad (1).$$

A set of inputs X_i includes Gross National Income, the size of agriculture and tourism sectors, the government wage bill and a measure of geographic dispersion. If E equals 1, the country collects the maximum tax revenues possible, using the inputs.

The natural logarithm form of Equation (1) provides the basis for the basic econometric model as proposed by Aigner and others (1977):

$$\ln(TR_{it}) = \ln[f(X_{it}, \beta)] + \ln(E_{it}) + v_{it}; \quad (2).$$

Assuming the tax revenue input function $[f(X_{it}, \beta)]$ is linear in logarithms and defining the inefficiency as $u_{it} = -\ln(E_{it})$:

$$\ln(TR_{it}) = \alpha + \sum \beta \ln(X_{it}) + v_{it} - u_{it}; \quad (3).$$

⁴² Estimating the frontier for a subset of countries with unique characteristics has been applied to countries with abundant natural resources (Fenochietto and Pessino 2013) and in Sub-Saharan Africa (Caldeira and others 2020).

Following Langford and Ohlenburg (2016) and using the specification (3), we use a time-varying inefficiency model for panel data that accounts for observable heterogeneity (Battese and Coelli 1995). The parameters of the stochastic frontier and the inefficiency model are estimated simultaneously to avoid bias. The unobserved time-invariant heterogeneity is captured in a “true random effects” model.⁴³ As in Langford and Ohlenburg (2016), we interpret unobserved heterogeneity as a lack of tax effort, suggesting that the influence of the unobserved factors could be overcome with tax policy and administration measures.

Data

We begin with 25 SDS listed in Annex 1 over the period from 1995 to 2019. Data are taken from the WoRLD, World Economic Outlook, World Development Indicators, International Financial Statistics and World Tourism Organization databases. Data on public sector employment and wage bills come from Gupta and others (2016). Data for selected indicators restrict our sample to 19 SDS: Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Belize, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Maldives, Mauritius, Micronesia, Samoa, Seychelles, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Timor-Leste and Vanuatu.

Appendix Table 1. Summary Statistics

Variables	High-Income	Upper Middle-Income	Lower Middle-Income	Entire sample average	Sample median	Observations
Tax revenue (without social security contribution) % of GDP	17.7	20.2	14.3	17.2	17.5	659
Gross National Income per capita in constant US\$	14,049.7	4,878.3	2,311.9	5,185.0	3,051.8	565
Geographic dispersion (in sq. km)	79,902.8	60,093.4	403,661.6	198,839.5	45,389.3	690
Value added in agriculture (% of GDP)	2.8	11.6	21.8	13.7	11.6	646
Tourism receipts (% of GDP)	34.8	18.5	8.6	18.0	16.1	561
Government wage bill (% of GDP)	9.2	9.4	11.2	10.0	9.4	536

Empirical Results

Table 2 indicates the coefficients in the models used to estimate the maximum level (capacity) of tax revenue that could be theoretically mobilized given an SDS’ economic structure and

⁴³ Greene (2005). It is important to note that the choice of how to model unobserved time-invariant heterogeneity in SFA can have a substantive impact on the estimated size of inefficiency (tax effort).

prevailing economic conditions.⁴⁴ The larger is the gap between the actual and theoretical tax revenue, the larger is scope for tax policy and revenue administration to reach the potential tax revenue. The gap for SDS is reported in Figure 7 of the main text.

The sign and statistical significance of the coefficients in the models are consistent with the literature, but also capture a specific economic and institutional structure of SDS.

Appendix Table 2. Stochastic Frontier Analysis Coefficients

VARIABLES	Tax revenue
<i>Frontier</i>	
Ln (per capita Gross National Income)	0.160*** (0.0205)
Ln (Tourism receipts as a share of GDP)	0.0265* (0.0139)
Ln (Agriculture as a share of GDP)	-0.159*** (0.0215)
Ln (Public sector wage bill as a share of GDP)	0.0888*** (0.0235)
Ln (Geographical dispersion)	0.0217*** (0.00843)
Constant	1.386*** (0.203)
<i>Inefficiency</i>	
Usigma	-4.718*** (0.537)
Vsigma	-4.780*** (0.208)
Theta	0.286*** (0.0105)
Observations	297
Number of countries	19
Standard errors in parentheses	
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1	

- **Economic development.** Tax revenues increase with the country's income level and economic development as higher-income countries (society) has a higher ability to pay taxes (Bahl 1971). We use Gross National Income per capita—accounting for both GDP and

⁴⁴ Estimates of alternative specifications and robustness tests—available upon request—are broadly in line with the baseline.

remittances from the diaspora particularly significant in SDS—to capture the impact of these variables on tax revenue potential in SDS.

- **Sectoral development.** Tax revenues are unusually lower in countries with a larger share of agriculture in GDP. This sector is characterized by a higher number of tax exemptions, small producers, and a higher level of informality (Fenochietto and Pessino, 2013). In contrast, tax revenues are higher in countries with larger tourism receipts (as a share of GDP) as this sector is comprised of larger hotels and transportation companies (Glenday and others 2019).
- **Size of the public sector.** The impact of the public sector on tax revenue is ambiguous. On one side, in many developing countries, the public sector contributes to the bulk of personal income tax revenue. Hence, a larger public sector would imply higher taxes. On the other hand, a large public sector can indicate a less diversified economy and a narrowing of the tax base (e.g., the public sector does not pay corporate income tax), contributing to lower tax revenues. Our estimates indicate a positive coefficient associated with the size of the public sector—as a key economic actor—in SDS.
- **Geographic characteristics.** The main text stresses the impact of geographic location and dispersion on sustainable development and climate resilience goals. These characteristics are difficult to approximate by existing indicators. We use a distance in kilometers between the extreme north-south and east-west borders of each SDS to capture the dispersion and multiply it by import deflators to capture the impact of some SDS' distant location. The role of geographic characteristics on tax revenue is ambiguous. On the one hand, geographic dispersion may reflect a country's size, which is positively correlated with tax revenue. On the other hand, tax collection may be weaker in more 'disperse' countries with lower collection capacities. Our estimates indicate a positive relationship.

ANNEX 6. EXAMPLES OF 'CLIMATE FUNDS'

Global Environment Facility (GEF). Countries are eligible for GEF funding if they have ratified UNFCCC. The GEF is used for a range of climate and environment-related projects and operates through 18 partner agencies, which are selected to deploy funds. These are the only institutions that can access GEF funding directly. Special funds include the Special Climate Change Fund , which supports adaptation and technology transfer and the Least Developed Countries Fund , which is accessible specifically to LDCs that are vulnerable to adverse impacts of climate change.

Green Climate Fund (GCF). A range of instruments, including grants, concessional loans, etc., that support the delivery of the NDCs. Developing country parties to UNFCCC are eligible. The GCF requires both a nationally designated authority and an Accredited Entity . Organizations seen to have specialized capacities in climate action may apply to be an Accredited Entity and can be private, public, non-governmental, sub-national, national, regional or international. The fund supports eight impact areas across two broad categories: low-emission sustainable development and increasing climate-resilience.

Climate Investment Funds (CIF). Concessional finance is provided to accelerate climate action by empowering transformation in clean technology and renewable energy sources, making them cost-competitive with fossil fuels (e.g., Climate Investment Fund 2019). Recipient countries must meet the Official Development Assistance eligibility criteria and have an active MDB program. Specific funds include the Clean Technology Fund , the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience and the Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries Program .

Adaptation Fund. Grants are provided to developing country members of the UNFCCC list of parties, and financing flows through accredited implementing entities. Investments predominately support food security, agriculture, water management and disaster risk reduction projects for the promotion of community resilience.

Climate Funds for preparedness and response. Activities that address the impacts of hazards are also available to SDS. This support is provided both through MDBs and climate funds. The **Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)**, for example, targets the most disaster-prone countries and provides grants in support of building resilience and enabling recovery. Through its **Small Island States Resilience Initiative (SISRI)**, technical assistance supports small island states to build pipelines of resilient investments to withstand climate change impacts.

REFERENCES

- African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the European Investment Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank Group, the Islamic Development Bank, and the World Bank Group, 2020, *Joint Report on Multilateral Development Banks' Climate Finance*, August 2020
- Aigner, D., C.A.K. Lovell and P. Schmidt, 1977, "Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production function models", *Journal of Econometrics* 6: 21-37.
- Allen, R., M. El Rayess, L. Doherty, and P. Goel, 2020, "Review of the Public Financial Management Reform Strategy for Pacific Island Countries, 2010-2020," IMF Working paper 20/183, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Babii, A., S. Cevik, S. Kaendera, D. Muir, S. Nadeem, and G. Salinas (2021), "Tourism in the Post Pandemic World Economic Challenges and Opportunities for Asia-Pacific and the Western Hemisphere," IMF ADP-WHD Department al paper *forthcoming*, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Bahl, R.W., 1971, "A regression approach to tax effort and tax ratio analysis," *Staff Papers*, 18(3), pp.570-612.
- Battese, G.E. and T.J. Coelli. 1995, "A Model for Technical Inefficiency Effects in a Stochastic Frontier Production Function for Panel Data," *Empirical Economics* 20: 325-332.
- Benedek, D., E. Gemayel, A. Senhadji, and A. F. Tieman, 2021, "A Post-Pandemic Assessment of the Sustainable Development Goals," IMF Staff Discussion Note *forthcoming*, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Bonato, L., A. Cheasty, M. Pigato, K. Antoine, A. De Kleine Feige, A. Guerson, S. Lakhtakia, I. Parry, G. Salinas, and D. Stephan, 2018, St. Lucia. "Climate Change Policy Assessment," IMF Country Report 18/181, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Burdescu, R, C. van den Berg, N. Janson, and O. Alvarado, 2020, "A Benchmark for the Performance of State-Owned Water Utilities in the Caribbean," World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Caldeira, E., A. Compaoré ,A. Adessé Dama, M. Mansour,G. Rota-Graziosi, 2020, "Tax effort in Sub-Saharan African countries: evidence from a new dataset," Working Papers hal-02543162, HAL.

- Cheasty, A., B. Garnaud, T. Konuki, I. Parry, and W. Samuel, 2017, "Seychelles. Climate Change Policy Assessment," IMF Country Report 17/162, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Cheasty, A., D. Leigh, I. Parry, D. Vasilyev, M. Boyer, R. Gunasekera, and R. Alfaro-Pelico, 2018. Belize. "Climate Change Policy Assessment," IMF Country Report 18/329, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Climate Central, 2019, *Source Data for Coastal DEM*, "Flooded Future: Global vulnerability to sea level rise worse than previously understood."
<https://www.climatecentral.org/news/report-flooded-future-global-vulnerability-to-sea-level-rise-worse-than-previously-understood>.
- Climate Investment Funds, 2019, *Preparing Outer Island Sustainable Electricity Development Project*,
- Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, 2019, "Climate Change and Small States Parliamentarian's Toolkit: A guide for effective climate action," CPA Small Branches Network, London, UK.
- Cyan, M., J. Martinez-Vazquez and V. Vulovic. 2013, "Measuring tax effort: Does the estimation approach matter and should effort be linked to expenditure goals?," International Center for Public Policy Working Paper 13-08, Atlanta, GA.
- Daniel, J., A. Banerji, A. Blackman, S. Ester, T. Moeaki, R. Neves, N. Palu, V. Piatkov, D. Prihardini, C. Sandoz, and A. Zdzienicka, 2020, "Climate Change Policy Assessment for Tonga," April 2020, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Daniel, J., L. Doherty, G. Preston, T. Schneider (2021) "Barriers Preventing Pacific Island Countries Access to Climate Financing," IMF Working Paper *forthcoming*, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Davies, M., B. Lissovolik, I. Parry, A. Guerson, G. Huang, T. Komatsuzaki, W. Mitchell and M. Boyer, 2019 (a), "Grenada. Climate Change Policy Assessment," IMF Country Report 19/193, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Davies, M., M. Nozaki, R. Singh, K. Abdelkader, A. Le, D. Prihardini, G. Huang, and S. Esler, 2019 (b), "Federated States of Micronesia. Climate Change Policy Assessment," IMF Country Report 19/292, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Fenochietto, R. and C. Pessino. 2013, "Understanding Countries' Tax Effort," IMF Working Paper 13/244, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Gaspar, V., D. Amaglobeli, M. Garcia-Escribano, D. Prady, and M. Soto, 2019, "Fiscal Policy and Development: Human, Social, and Physical Investment for the SDGs," Staff Discussion Note 19/03, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Georgieva, K., 2020, "Beyond the Crisis," *Finance & Development*, June 2020, vol. 57/2.

Green Climate Fund <https://www.greenclimate.fund/about>

Greene, W.H., 2005. "Fixed and Random Effects in Stochastic Frontier Models," *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 23: 7–32. https://centerforpolicyimpact.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/18/2019/04/CPIGH-Report_Tax-report_Enhancing-Domestic-Revenues_April-2019_FINAL.pdf

Glenday, G., I. Bharali, and Z. Wang. 2019, "A Cross-Country Comparative Study of Tax Capacity, Effort and Gaps." 2019, 171.

Griffith-Jones, S; Attridge, S; and Gouett, M., 2020, "Securing Climate Finance Through National Development Banks," *ODI Report* January 2020

Gupta, S.; D. Coady; M. Fouad; R. Hughes; M. Garcia-Escribano; T. Curristine; C. Abdallah; K. Dybczak; Y. Endegnanew; M. Francese; T. Hansen; L.F. Jirasavetakul; M. Nozaki; B. Shang; M. Simmonds; and M. Soto, 2016, "Managing Government Compensation and Employment - Institutions, Policies, and Reform Challenges," Policy Papers 47 (2016), International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.

Hallegatte, S., M. Bangalore, L. Bonzanigo, M. Fay, T. Kane, U. Narloch, J. Rozenberg, D. Treguer, A. Vogt-Schilb, 2016, "Shock Waves: Managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty," Climate Change and Development Series, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Hallegatte, S., A. Vogt-Schilb, M. Bangalore, and J. Rosenberg, 2017, "Unbreakable: Building the Resilience of the Poor in the Face of Natural Disasters," Climate Change and Development Series, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Hallegatte, S., J. Rentschler, and J. Rosenberg, 2019 (a), "Lifelines. The Resilient Infrastructure Opportunity," World Bank, Washington, DC.

Hallegatte, S., J. Rentschler, J. Rosenberg, C. Nicolas, C. Fox, 2019 (b), "Strengthening New Infrastructure Assets. A Cost-Benefit Analysis," Policy Research Working Paper 8896, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Hutton, G. and M. Varughese, 2016, "The Cost of Meeting the 2030 Sustainable Development Goal Targets on Drinking Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene," World Bank, Washington, DC.

IFC, 2016, "Climate Investment Opportunities in Emerging Markets, International Finance Corporation," Washington, DC.

International Monetary Fund, 2016, "Small States' Resilience to Natural Disasters and Climate Change—Role of the IMF," IMF Policy Paper, Washington, DC.

———, 2018, "2017 Staff Guidance Note on the Fund's Engagement with Small Developing States," Washington, DC.

———, 2019, "Building Resilience in Developing Countries Vulnerable to Large Natural Disasters," IMF Policy Paper 19/020, Washington, DC.

- , 2019, 2020 (a), *World Economic Outlook*, “The Great Lockdown,” Washington, DC. April 2020.
- , 2020 (b), *World Economic Outlook*, “A Long and Difficult Ascent,” Washington, DC. October 2020.
- IPCC, 2019, “Special Report on the Ocean and the Cryosphere in a Changing Climate,” <https://www.ipcc.ch/srocc/>
- Langford, B. and T. Ohlenburg. 2016, “Tax revenue potential and effort – an empirical investigation,” S-43202-UGA-1. International Growth Centre, London, UK.
- Mitchell, A., M. Wickham, and M. Torres, 2020, “Strengthening Public Investment Management in the Eastern Caribbean Currency Union: Getting more bang for the dollar!,” IMF Working Paper, 20/177, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Miyamoto International, 2019 a, “Overview of Engineering Options for Increasing Infrastructure Resilience,” Background Paper for Lifeline Report, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Miyamoto International, 2019 b, “Increasing Infrastructure Resilience -- Technical Annex,” Technical annex to background paper above, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Nishizawa, H., S. Roger, and H. Zang. 2019, “Fiscal Buffers for Natural Disasters in Pacific Island Countries,” IMF Working Paper 19/152, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- OECD and World Bank, 2016, “Climate and Disaster Resilience Financing in Small Island Developing States,” joint report by OECD, SISRI and the Climate Change Group of the World Bank, Washington, DC.
- OECD, 2018, “Climate-resilient Infrastructure. Policy Perspective,” OECD Environmental Policy Paper. 14, Paris, France.
- OECD, 2020, “Climate Finance Provided and Mobilized by Developed Countries in 2013-2018,” OECD, Paris, France.
- Parry, I., B. Shang, P. Wingender, N. Vernon, and T. Narasimhan, 2016, “Climate Mitigation in China: Which Policies Are Most Effective?,” IMF Working Paper 16/148, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Parry, I., V. Mylonas, and N. Vernon, 2017, “Reforming Energy Policy in India: Assessing the Options,” IMF Working Paper 17/103, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Rozenberg, J. and M. Fay, 2019, “Beyond the Gap: How Countries Can Afford the Infrastructure They Need while Protecting the Planet. Sustainable Infrastructure,” World Bank, Washington, DC.

Tanner, T., Bisht, H., Quevedo, A., Malik, M., Nadiruzzaman, M., Biswas, S., 2019, "Enabling Access to the Green Climate Fund: Sharing Country Lessons From South Asia," *Action On Climate Today Learning Paper*, Oxford Policy Management and ODI, UK.

UNFCCC at <https://unfccc.int/>.

UNICEF and WHO, 2019, "Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2017. Special focus on inequalities," New York, NY.

World Bank, 2016, "World Bank Group Engagement in Small States the Cases of the OECS, Pacific Island Countries, Cabo Verde, Djibouti, Mauritius, and the Seychelles — Clustered Country Program Evaluation," Washington, DC.

World Bank, 2020, "Understanding Poverty – Topics – Water – Overview," World Bank Group Water Global Practice, Washington, DC.

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/water/overview#2> (accessed 15 October 2020).

World Travel & Tourism Council, 2019, *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact Reports*.

<https://wttc.org/Research/Economic-Impact>.